

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending. Claims 1-40 have been rejected. Claims 41-44 have been added as dependent claims of claims 1, 13, 25, and 37, respectively. Support for claims 41-44 can be found, for example, in Applicant's specification at paras. [0030] and [0062]-[0064].

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-13, 18-25, and 30-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Shoemaker et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0167197 ("Shoemaker"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

As amended, independent claim 1 is directed to a method for accessing sales data including the feature of "populating a list control element of the web page with the at least one question, the at least one question used to query a sales database constructed by aggregating and transforming data from at least two disparate sales databases, the at least two disparate sales databases from a corresponding at least two different sales data sources." Independent claims 13, 25, and 37 are directed to a logic arrangement, a system, and a method for specifying sales data to be accessed, respectively, and contain similar recitations. Applicant submits that *Shoemaker* neither discloses nor suggests these techniques.

Instead, *Shoemaker* discloses a client relationship measurement and management system including a database of companies and their clients. *Shoemaker*, [0017]. *Shoemaker* discloses a customer satisfaction survey database, but nothing in *Shoemaker* teaches or suggests a sales database. *Id.*, at [0029].

In addition, nothing in *Shoemaker* teaches or suggests a sales database constructed by aggregating and transforming data from at least two disparate sales databases, the at least two disparate sales databases from a corresponding at least two different sales data sources.

Shoemaker discloses a database into which a central computer stores customer satisfaction survey data from various customers. *Id.* at Abstract. However, survey data gathered from customers in *Shoemaker* does not constitute data from disparate databases. In fact, the customer surveys are immediately returned from the customer to the central computer, without being stored. “Customer respondents complete survey questions on-line, and survey responses are returned to the central computer upon completion of each survey.” *Id.* at Abstract.

Accordingly, nothing in *Shoemaker* teaches or suggests the method as recited in claim 1, the logic arrangement as recited in claim 13, the system as recited in claim 25, or the method as recited in claim 37, and, at least for these reasons, claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 define over the cited art. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 is Respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 6-12, 18-24, 30-36, and 38-40 define over the cited art at least for the foregoing reasons because of their dependence from claims 1, 13, 25, and 37, respectively. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 6-12, 18-24, 30-36, and 38-40 is Respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 2-3, 14-15, and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shoemaker*, further in view of Zawadzki et al., U.S. Pat. No. 7,107,268 and claims 4-5, 16-17, and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shoemaker*, further in view of Wright et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0016910.

Dependent claims 2-5, 14-17, and 26-29 define over the cited art at least for the foregoing reasons because of their dependence from claims 1, 13, and 25, respectively. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2-5, 14-17, and 26-29 is Respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants hereby authorize the Commissioner to charge payment of any additional fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 02-4377. In the event that the application is not deemed in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in an effort to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

By: / Jack L. Chen /
Jack L. Chen
Patent Office Reg. No. 48,634

Paul. A. Ragusa
Patent Office Reg. No. 38,587

30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112-4498
(212) 408-2500

Attorneys for Applicant(s)